

Anisotropic Superconductivity of Quasi-One-Dimensional Electrons in Magnetic Field

Mitake Miyazaki and Yasumasa Hasegawa
Faculty of Science, Himeji Institute of Technology,
Kamigouri-cho, Akou-gun, Hyogo 678-12, Japan

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We study theoretically the transition temperature $T_c(H)$ of a quasi-one-dimensional anisotropic superconductor in a magnetic field, which is thought to be realized in organic conductors, $(\text{TMTSF})_2\text{X}$. In the weak field limit, $-dH_{c2}/dT$ for the anisotropic singlet is shown to be $\sqrt{3}$ times larger than that for the anisotropic triplet in the case of attractive interaction of electrons at nearest-sites along the c axis and magnetic field along the b axis. In the strong field region the transition temperature for spin-triplet is restored to zero field critical temperature while the anisotropic spin-singlet is suppressed by the Zeeman effect. There should be a transition from anisotropic singlet to anisotropic triplet as the magnetic field is increased.

1 Introduction

Recently, the reentrance of the superconductivity of quasi-one-dimensional electrons in a strong magnetic field attracts theoretical interest. [1, 2, 3, 4] The anomaly of the resistivity in a strong field is observed, [5] which is thought to be a signal of the superconductivity. The superconductivity in a strong field is understood as follows. When the magnetic field is applied along the b axis, which is different direction from the field-induced spin density wave (FISDW) case, the semi-classical orbits of electrons are localized in the a - b plane (where a and b is the most conducting and second conducting axes, respectively), i.e. the motion along the c axis is bounded. Since the orbital frustration due to the magnetic field comes from the motion of electrons in the plane perpendicular to the magnetic field, electrons can make Cooper pairs without affected by the orbital frustration in the strong field limit. The superconductivity in

strong magnetic field can be also understood by nothing that the quasi-one-dimensional system in the magnetic field is essentially one -dimension with the field-dependent effective interaction. [6]

Lebed' [1] and Dupuis *et al.* [2, 3, 4] have calculated the mean-field critical temperature of a quasi-one-dimensional superconductor. In these papers they considered both singlet and triplet pairings but they assumed the isotropic superconductivity, i.e. the energy gap is constant at the Fermi surface. However, considering the recent experimental results of NMR relaxation rate [7], impurity effect [8] and proximity to the SDW phase [9] in the (TMTSF)₂X, the superconductivity in the quasi-one-dimensional organics is thought to be not the conventional type with the constant energy gap.

In the previous paper we have calculated the effective interactions in the magnetic field by assuming the attractive interaction between electrons at the nearest-sites in the c direction, which results in the anisotropic superconductivity. [6] For this case the transition temperatures for the spin-singlet and spin-triplet are degenerate in the absence of the magnetic field. We got the different magnetic field dependence of the superconductivity of anisotropic singlet and triplet. In that paper we took the quantum limit approximation (QLA), which is valid for the strong field. In the intermediate field, the transition temperature calculated in the QLA is known to be smaller than that without the QLA. [10]

In this paper we study the transition temperature of the anisotropic superconductivity in a quasi-one-dimensional system by extending an elegant approach used by Lebed' and Dupuis *et al.*

We also consider the effect of Pauli pair-breaking for an anisotropic superconductivity by taking account of the Zeeman term. In general, the critical field of spin-singlet superconductivity is decreased by the Pauli pair-breaking effect. When the number of quasi particle polarized by magnetic field exceeds a critical value, Cooper pairs $(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2 \uparrow, -\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2 \downarrow)$ with total momentum $\mathbf{q}$ are stabilized rather than those of $(\mathbf{k} \uparrow, -\mathbf{k} \downarrow)$. The inhomogeneous superconductivity with spatial oscillation of the gap function is then possible, as was pointed out by Fulde and Ferrell [11] and Larkin and Ovchinnikov [12] (FFLO state). In three dimensional case with a spherical Fermi surface, the FFLO state is known to be possible only in the small region of magnetic field. However, in the one-dimensional case, the electron $(-\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2 \downarrow)$ is always on the down-spins Fermi surface for any $(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{q}/2 \uparrow)$ on the up-spin Fermi surface if we take an appropriate choice of $\mathbf{q}$. [13, 14] As a result, at least a half of the Fermi surface is available for pairing, so that the reentrance in the strong field is not completely suppressed by the Pauli pair-breaking effect even for the spin-singlet pairing.

2 Gap equation

We consider the anisotropic superconductivity described by the dispersion law (we take $\hbar = k_B = 1$ throughout the paper)

$$E_{k\sigma} = v_F(|k_x| - k_F) - 2t_b \cos(bk_y) - 2t_c \cos(ck_z) + \sigma\mu_B H, \quad (1)$$

where $v_F = 2at_a \sin(ak_F)$ is the Fermi velocity for the motion along the a axis, t_a , t_b and t_c are the transfer integrals along a , b and c axes, respectively, a , b and c are lattice constants and $\sigma\mu_B H$ is the Zeeman energy for $\uparrow$ ($\downarrow$) spin ($\sigma = +(-)$). For simplicity we take a , b and c axes to be perpendicular each other and to be along the x , y and z directions, respectively.

For the non-interaction Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_0$ of a quasi-one-dimensional system we take account of the magnetic field by the Peierls substitution, i.e. $\mathcal{H}_0 = E(\mathbf{k} \rightarrow -i\nabla - e\mathbf{A})$. When the vector potential $\mathbf{A}$ is taken as $\mathbf{A} = (0, 0, -Hx)$, the eigenstates and the corresponding eigenvalues are given by

$$\phi_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\alpha(x, l, m) = e^{ik_x x + ik_y bl + ik_z cm - i\alpha \frac{2t_c}{\omega_c} \sin(k_z c - Gx)} \quad (2)$$

and

$$\epsilon_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\alpha = v_F(\alpha k_x - k_F) - 2t_b \cos(k_y b) + \sigma\mu_B H, \quad (3)$$

where the integers l and m label the sites in the directions y and z , $\alpha = \text{sgn}(k_x)$ refers to the right/left sheet of the Fermi surface, and $\omega_c = ev_F cH$. The one-particle Green's function of a quasi-one-dimensional system is represented by

$$\begin{aligned} G_\sigma^\alpha(x, x', k_y, k_z, \omega_n) &= e^{-i\alpha \frac{2t_c}{\omega_c} [\sin(k_z c - Gx) - \sin(k_z c - Gx')]} \\ &\times \sum_{k_x} e^{ik_x(x-x')} \tilde{G}_\sigma^\alpha(k_x, k_y, \omega_n) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with

$$\tilde{G}_\sigma^\alpha(k_x, k_y, \omega_n) = \frac{1}{i\omega_n - v_F(\alpha k_x - k_F) + 2t_b \cos(k_y b) - \sigma\mu_B H} \quad (5)$$

where $\omega_n = (2n + 1)\pi T$ is a Matsubara frequency.

The interaction Hamiltonian is written as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha, \alpha', \sigma, \sigma'} \sum_{\langle i, j \rangle} U_{ij} \psi_\sigma^{\alpha' \dagger}(\mathbf{r}_i) \psi_{\sigma'}^{\bar{\alpha}' \dagger}(\mathbf{r}_j) \psi_{\sigma'}^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbf{r}_j) \psi_\sigma^\alpha(\mathbf{r}_i), \quad (6)$$

where U_{ij} is the interaction between electrons at i and j sites and $\bar{\alpha} = -\alpha$. The $\psi_\sigma^\alpha(\mathbf{r})$'s are operators for electrons moving on the sheet α of the Fermi surface:

$$\psi_\sigma^\alpha(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\alpha k_x > 0} \sum_{k_y, k_z} \phi_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\alpha(\mathbf{r}) C_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\alpha, \quad (7)$$

where $C_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\alpha$ ($C_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^{\alpha\dagger}$) is the annihilation (creation) operator of an electron in the state $\phi_{\mathbf{k},\sigma}^\alpha(\mathbf{r})$.

In this paper we take the nearest-site interaction along c axis and on-site interaction as

$$U_{ij} = \begin{cases} U & \text{if } \mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{r}_j \pm c\hat{\mathbf{z}} \\ U_0 & \text{if } \mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{r}_j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}. \quad (8)$$

We define the order parameter corresponding to spin-singlet pairing state

$$\Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow}^{(s)}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) = U_{ij} \sum_{\alpha} \langle \psi_{\uparrow}^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbf{r}_j) \psi_{\downarrow}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_i) \rangle \quad (9)$$

and spin-triplet pairing state

$$\Delta_{\sigma\sigma'}^{(t)}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) = U_{ij} \sum_{\alpha} \langle \psi_{\sigma'}^{\bar{\alpha}}(\mathbf{r}_j) \psi_{\sigma}^{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}_i) \rangle \alpha. \quad (10)$$

In the mean field approximation, the linearized gap equation is obtained as

$$\Delta(x, q_z) = \int_{|x-x'|>d} dx' K(x, x', q_z) \Delta(x', q_z), \quad (11)$$

where d^{-1} is related to cutoff energy Ω . The kernel K for the anisotropic spin-singlet ($\Delta = \Delta_{\uparrow\downarrow}$) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} K^{(s)}(x, x', q_z) &= -2UT \sum_{\omega_n} \sum_{\alpha, k_y, k_z} \cos^2(ck_z) G_{\uparrow}^{\alpha}(x, x', k_y, k_z + \frac{q_z}{2}, \omega_n) \\ &\quad \times G_{\downarrow}^{\bar{\alpha}}(x, x', -k_y, -k_z + \frac{q_z}{2}, -\omega_n) \\ &= \frac{-UT \cos[2\mu_B H(x-x')/v_F]}{bcv_F^2 \sinh[|x-x'|2\pi T/v_F]} \\ &\quad \times [J_0(A(x, x', q_z)) + J_2(A(x, x', q_z))], \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $J_n(A)$ is the n th-order Bessel function, $G = eHc$, and

$$A(x, x', q_z) = \frac{8t_c}{\omega_c} \sin[\frac{G}{2}(x-x')] \sin[q_z \frac{c}{2} - \frac{G}{2}(x+x')]. \quad (13)$$

For the anisotropic spin-triplet ($\Delta = \Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ or $\Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow}$) we get the kernel as

$$\begin{aligned} K^{(t)}(x, x', q_z) &= -2UT \sum_{\omega_n} \sum_{\alpha, k_y, k_z} \sin^2(ck_z) G_{\sigma}^{\alpha}(x, x', k_y, k_z + \frac{q_z}{2}, \omega_n) \\ &\quad \times G_{\sigma}^{\bar{\alpha}}(x, x', -k_y, -k_z + \frac{q_z}{2}, -\omega_n) \\ &= \frac{-UT}{bcv_F^2} \frac{1}{\sinh[|x-x'|2\pi T/v_F]} \\ &\quad \times [J_0(A(x, x', q_z)) - J_2(A(x, x', q_z))], \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

while for the isotropic spin-singlet the kernel is given by [1, 2, 3]

$$K^{(\text{iso})}(x, x', q_z) = \frac{-U_0 T \cos[2\mu_B H(x - x')/v_F]}{bcv_F^2 \sinh[|x - x'|2\pi T/v_F]} J_0(A(x, x', q_z)). \quad (15)$$

If the on-site interaction is repulsive ($U_0 > 0$), the isotropic spin-singlet is not realized.

In the present assumption for the interaction the isotropic spin-triplet does not occur. The isotropic spin-triplet is possible only when the backward and forward scattering constants are different, which will be the case when the attractive interaction exists between electrons on the nearest-sites along the a axis.

2.1 Transition temperature for a weak field

In the weak field limit ($\omega_c \ll T$), where the magnetic length $2\pi/G$ is much larger than the thermal length $v_F/2\pi T$, we can expand the order parameter and Bessel function in $(x - x')$. We can also neglect the Zeeman term in this limit. Then the second-order differential equation is given by

$$-v_F^2 \frac{\partial^2 \Delta}{\partial x^2} + 4\eta t_c^2 [1 - \cos(q_z c - 2Gx)] \Delta = \frac{16\pi^2}{7\zeta(3)} T_{c0}^2 \left(1 - \frac{T_c}{T_{c0}}\right) \Delta, \quad (16)$$

where $T_{c0} = (v_F/\pi d) \exp(-\pi b c v_F/U)$ is the transition temperature in the absence of magnetic field, $\zeta(z)$ is the Riemann's zeta function and

$$\eta = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for isotropic superconductivity} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{for anisotropic spin-singlet} \\ \frac{3}{2} & \text{for anisotropic spin-triplet.} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

When $T_{c0} \ll t_c$, it can be further simplified by replacing the periodic potential in the lhs by a set of decoupled harmonic potential located at points $(q_z c/2 + n\pi)/G$. Then we get the critical temperature as

$$T_c(H) = T_{c0} - \sqrt{2\eta} \frac{7\zeta(3)}{8\pi^2} \frac{t_c v_F e c}{T_{c0}} H, \quad (18)$$

or

$$-\frac{dH_{c2}^b}{dT} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\eta}} \frac{8\pi^2 T_{c0}}{7\zeta(3) t_c v_F e c}. \quad (19)$$

The upper critical field H_{c2}^b in this region is $\sqrt{3}$ times larger for anisotropic spin-singlet than for anisotropic spin-triplet. If the magnetic field is applied along the c axis, $-dH_{c2}^c/dT = 8\pi^2 T_{c0}/(7\sqrt{2}\zeta(3)t_b v_F e b)$, for both anisotropic spin-singlet and spin-triplet in the weak field limit. Its value is the same as that for the isotropic superconductivity. In contrast with this case, if the attractive interaction works between electrons along b axis,

$-dH_{c2}^c/dT = 8\pi^2 T_{c0}/(7\sqrt{2}\eta\zeta 3)t_b v_F e b$ for the weak magnetic field along c axis and $-dH_{c2}^b/dT = 8\pi^2 T_{c0}/(7\sqrt{2}\zeta(3)t_c v_F e c)$ for the field along b axis.

We compare above results with the upper critical field ($-dH_{c2}^b/dT = 1.84$ and $-dH_{c2}^c/dT = 0.111[\text{T/K}]$) observed by Murata *et al* [15] for $(\text{TMTSF})_2\text{ClO}_4$. When we take the parameters as $b = 7.7\text{\AA}$, $c = 13.5\text{\AA}$, the ratio of transfer integrals are $t_c/t_b = 0.034$ if we fit the experiments with the isotropic superconductivity. If we assume the attractive interaction along the c axis as studied in this paper we get $t_c/t_b = 0.048$. In the case of attractive interaction along the b axis, we get $t_c/t_b = 0.028$ to fit the experiment.

2.2 Transition temperature for any magnetic field

Without using the weak field approximation studied in the previous section, we can solve the linearized gap equation eq.(11) numerically as done by Dupuis and Montambaux [2, 3] for isotropic superconductivity. We write

$$\Delta_Q(x) = e^{iQx} \sum_l \Delta_{2l}^Q e^{i2lGx}, \quad (20)$$

where Bloch wave vector Q is taken as $-G < Q \leq G$. Then eq.(11) is written as a matrix equation

$$\Delta_{2l}^Q = \sum_{l'} A_{2l,2l'}^Q \Delta_{2l'}^Q, \quad (21)$$

where

$$A_{2l,2l'}^Q = \sum_N K_{N-2l,N-2l'} \tilde{K}(Q + NG), \quad (22)$$

In the above $\tilde{K}(q_x)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{K}(q_x) &= T \sum_{\omega_n} \sum_{\alpha, k_x, k_y} \tilde{G}_\sigma^\alpha(k_x, k_y, \omega_n) \tilde{G}_{\bar{\sigma}}^{\bar{\alpha}}(q_x - k_x, -k_y, -\omega_n) \\ &= \frac{cN(0)}{2} \sum_{\alpha} \left[\ln \left(\frac{2\Omega\gamma}{\pi T} \right) + \Psi \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \text{Re} \Psi \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha v_F q_x + 2\mu_B H}{4i\pi T} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

for the spin-singlet, where $N(0) = 1/\pi v_F b c$ is the density of states for one spin at the Fermi energy, γ is the exponential of the Euler constant, Ω is the cut-off energy, and Ψ is the digamma function. For the spin-triplet, Pauli pair breaking term $2\mu_B H$ in the digamma function should be eliminated.

The coefficients K_{N_1, N_2} are given for the anisotropic singlet as

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{N_1, N_2}^{(s)} &= \frac{-2U}{c} e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}(N_1 - N_2)} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{du}{2\pi} \cos^2(u) J_{N_1} \left(\frac{4t_c}{\omega_c} \sin(u) \right) \\
&\quad \times J_{N_2} \left(\frac{4t_c}{\omega_c} \sin(u) \right), \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

and for the anisotropic triplet as

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{N_1, N_2}^{(t)} &= \frac{-2U}{c} e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}(N_1 - N_2)} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{du}{2\pi} \sin^2(u) J_{N_1} \left(\frac{4t_c}{\omega_c} \sin(u) \right) \\
&\quad \times J_{N_2} \left(\frac{4t_c}{\omega_c} \sin(u) \right), \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

while for the isotropic singlet

$$K_{N_1, N_2}^{(\text{iso})} = \frac{-U_0}{c} e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}(N_1 - N_2)} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{du}{2\pi} J_{N_1} \left(\frac{4t_c}{\omega_c} \sin(u) \right) J_{N_2} \left(\frac{4t_c}{\omega_c} \sin(u) \right). \tag{26}$$

If we take the most divergent term ($v_F(Q + NG) + 2\mu_B H = 0$) and neglect the others in eq.(22), we get the result in QLA.

A. Without Zeeman effect

We first consider the case without Pauli pair breaking. In Fig.1 the transition temperature for anisotropic and isotropic spin-singlet is shown as a function of $h = H/H_0$, where $H_0 = 4t_c/v_F ebc$. [16] We take parameters for the organic conductor as $a \approx 7.3\text{\AA}$, $c \approx 13.5\text{\AA}$, $t_a \approx 2900\text{K}$, $t_c \approx 17\text{K}$ and $ak_F = \pi/4$, and get $H_0 \approx 11.4\text{T}$. Here two transition lines are characterized by the order parameter for $Q = 0$ or $Q = G$. The very small oscillation of the transition line for the anisotropic spin-singlet exists in $0.05 < h < 0.25$ in the present choice of parameters. The recovering to zero field critical temperature starts from lower field in the anisotropic spin-singlet case than in the isotropic case. In Fig.2 we plot the transition temperature for anisotropic and isotropic triplet with the same parameters as in Fig.1. The magnetic field dependence of transition temperature for isotropic spin-triplet is the same as that for isotropic spin-singlet. In the case for the anisotropic spin-triplet, the oscillation is large and the recovering starts from higher field than the isotropic type (Fig.2).

These results are consistent with those obtained in QLA. [6]

B. Zeeman effect

We next consider the effect of Pauli pair-breaking by taking account of the Zeeman term. As seen in eq.(23), logarithmic divergences occur at $Q = \pm 2\mu_B H/v_F$ and $Q = \pm(G - 2\mu_B H/v_F)$ even in the presence of the Zeeman term. We take

these values of Q and calculate the transition temperature. As shown in Fig.3, the transition temperature of the spin-singlet is considerably reduced by the Pauli pair-breaking effect. The transition temperature for $Q = \pm(G - 2\mu_B H/v_F)$ is too small to be seen for $h > 0.1$ and almost degenerate with that for $Q = \pm 2\mu_B H/v_F$ for $h < 0.1$ in Fig.3. In the case of equal-spin-pairing $\Delta_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and $\Delta_{\downarrow\downarrow}$, Zeeman splitting does not change the transition temperature. Thus, one will observe spin-triplet superconductivity in the strong field.

Even with the Zeeman effect, Cooper pairs of whole electrons in the Fermi surface contribute to superconductivity if the $N(\uparrow)$ th energy level coincides with the $N+1(\downarrow)$ th level by Zeeman splitting. In this case the Pauli pair breaking effect becomes not important, as shown in Fig.4. This is the case when $2\mu_B H = Gv_F$ as seen in eq.(23), which yields $act_a = \phi_0 \mu_B / \sqrt{2}\pi$, where $\phi_0 = hc_0/e$ is the flux quantum. This condition is satisfied if act_a is about 1/10 times of its value for organic conductors. This may be possible for a system with a large effective mass, or in the tilted magnetic field in the a - b plane, because the Zeeman splitting is in proportion to the magnetic field, while magnetic length with respect to orbital motion is in proportion to perpendicular component of the magnetic field. On the other hand, in the case of tilted magnetic field in the b - c plane, since hopping along b axis is suppressed at the same time, one has to consider competition between superconductivity and FISDW.

In the weak field limit the field dependence of the critical temperature is given by the parameter $t_c v_F \propto t_c t_a$, while in the strong field region it is given by $H_0 \propto t_c/v_F \propto t_c/t_a$ and T_{c0} . In order to fit the observed initial slope $-dH_{c2}^b/dT|_{T_{c0}}$ [3], we take $t_a t_c \sim 2100\text{K}^2$ for the anisotropic singlet case and $t_a t_c \sim 1500\text{K}^2$ for the isotropic singlet case. In Fig.5 we plot the transition temperature for the isotropic singlet and isotropic triplet by taking $t_c = 1.5\text{K}$ and $T_{c0} = 1.36\text{K}$. If we assume that the transition temperature for isotropic triplet in the absence of magnetic field is much smaller than that for the isotropic singlet, the result seems to be consistent with experiment as discussed by Dupuis [4] and Lee *et al.* [5] In Fig.6 we plot the critical temperature for the anisotropic singlet and anisotropic triplet as a function of the magnetic field by taking $t_c = 1.5\text{K}$ and $T_{c0} = 1.36\text{K}$. In this choice of parameters oscillation of the transition temperature for anisotropic triplet is pushed to the lower field. The transition temperature for the anisotropic spin-singlet with $Q = G - 2\mu_B H/v_F$ changes discontinuously to very small value at $H = H_c \sim 3.1\text{T}$. By changing Q we may get the continuous transition temperature in $H \geq H_c$, but this will be smaller than the transition temperature for $Q = 2\mu_B H/v_F$. Thus we did not consider the change of Q . As shown in Fig.6, the transition from anisotropic spin-singlet to anisotropic spin-triplet occurs about $H = 1.5\text{T}$ and the transition temperature increases above this field. This feature is not observed in the experiment. [5] This may be due to the assumption of the attractive interaction we have used in this paper. The part of attractive interaction would be caused by the anti-ferromagnetic spin fluctuation, which results in the spin-dependent effective interaction on the nearest-sites and favors the anisotropic singlet pair-

ing rather than anisotropic triplet pairing. Then the transition temperature for the anisotropic triplet becomes lower and the transition from anisotropic singlet to anisotropic triplet will occur at higher magnetic field. Then we can also explain the experiment by Lee *et al.* with the anisotropic superconductivity.

3 Conclusion

In this paper we have studied the transition temperature for a quasi-one-dimensional anisotropic superconductivity in a magnetic field applied along the b axis. Here we have assumed the nearest-site attractive interaction between electrons along c axis, which is independent of spin. The transition temperature for the anisotropic spin-singlet is same as that for the anisotropic spin-triplet in the absence of magnetic field. We have shown that the critical field for the anisotropic spin-singlet is $\sqrt{3}$ times larger than that for the anisotropic spin-triplet in the weak magnetic region.

We have calculated the transition line of spin-singlet superconductivity considering the Zeeman effect. Although spin-singlet state exists even with the Zeeman effect, the transition temperature is suppressed. On the other hand, spin-triplet superconductivity is not affected by the Zeeman effect. Therefore, the transition from spin-singlet to spin-triplet will occur as the magnetic field is increased.

The present results for anisotropic spin-singlet are consistent with the recent experiment by Lee *et al.* [5], which shows the signal for high field superconductivity, if we take into account the attractive interaction for the anisotropic spin-singlet and the relative suppression of the anisotropic spin-triplet caused by the anti-ferromagnetic spin fluctuation. Even in this case the transition from anisotropic spin-singlet to anisotropic spin-triplet will occur in the strong magnetic field as long as the spin-triplet is not destroyed completely.

Acknowledgments

This work is financially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research on the priority area "Novel Electronic States in Molecular Conductor" from the Ministry of Education.

References

References

- [1] A. G. Lebed': Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **44** (1986) 89. [JETP Lett. **44** (1986) 114.]
- [2] N. Dupuis, G. Montambaux, and C.A.R Sá de Melo: Phys. Rev. Lett. **70** (1993) 2613
- [3] N. Dupuis and G. Montambaux: Phys. Rev. **B 49** (1994) 8993.
- [4] N. Dupuis: Phys. Rev. **B 51** (1995) 9074.
- [5] I. J. Lee, A. P. Hope, M. J. Leone and M. J. Naughton: Appl. Superconductivity **2** (1994) 753. [Synth. Met. **70** 747.]
- [6] Y. Hasegawa and M. Miyazaki: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **65** (1996) 1028.
- [7] M. Takigawa, H. Yasuoka and G. Saito: J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **56** (1987) 873.
- [8] S. Tomić, D. Jérôme, D. Mailly, M. Ribault and K. Bechgaard: J. Phys. Paris. **44** C3 (1983) 1075.
- [9] D. Jerome, A. Mazude, M. Ribault and K. Bechgaard: J. de Phys. Lett. **41** (1980) 195.
- [10] Z. Tešanović, M. Rasolt and L. Xing: Phys. Rev. Lett. **63** (1989) 2425.
- [11] P. Fulde and A. Ferrell: Phys. Rev. **135** (1964) A550.
- [12] A. I. Larkin and Yu. N. Ovchinnikov: Sov. Phys. JETP **20** (1965) 762.
- [13] K. Machida and H. Nakanishi: Phys. Rev. **B 30** (1984) 122.
- [14] Y. Suzumura and K. Ishino: Prog. Theor. Phys. **70** (1983) 654.
- [15] K. Murata, M. Tokumoto, H. Anzai, K. Kajimura and T. Ishiguro: Jpn. J. Appl. Phys. **26** (1987) 1367.
- [16] In ref 6, H_0 is mistyped.

Figures

Fig.1. Critical temperature $T_c(H)/T_{c0}$ vs magnetic field along the b axis for the anisotropic singlet (solid lines) and isotropic singlet (broken lines). The Zeeman effect is neglected.

Fig.2. Critical temperature $T_c(H)/T_{c0}$ vs magnetic field for the anisotropic triplet (solid lines) and the isotropic singlet (broken lines).

Fig.3. The same as Fig.1 with the Zeeman effect.

Fig.4. The solid lines show Energy spectrum of a quasi-one-dimensional system in a magnetic field and the broken lines show the Zeeman splitting.

Fig.5. Critical temperature vs magnetic field for the isotropic singlet (solid lines) and isotropic triplet (broken lines). Parameters are taken to fit the initial slope of the critical field $-dH_{c2}^b/dT$ to the experiment and different from that in Figs.1~3.

Fig.6. Critical temperature $T_c(H)/T_{c0}$ vs magnetic field for the anisotropic spin-singlet (solid lines) and for the anisotropic spin-triplet (broken lines) with the different choice of parameters from that in Figs.1~3. The Zeeman effect is taken into account.